

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 05725.1418-00000

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	
	)	
Xavier BLIN et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 1611
	)	
Application No.: 10/529,265	)	Examiner: L. S. CHANNAVAJJALA
	)	
§371 (c) Date: September 28, 2005	)	
	)	
For: COMPOSITION COMPRISING A	)	Confirmation No.: 2134
BLOCK POLYMER AND A FILM-	)	
FORMING AGENT	)	

**MAIL STOP RCE**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**VIA EFS WEB**

Sir:

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(b)**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.56 and 1.97(b), Applicants bring to the attention of the Examiner the documents on the attached listing. This Information Disclosure Statement is being filed before the mailing date of a first Office Action after the filing of a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114, filed concurrently herewith, in the above-referenced application.

Copies of the listed office actions are attached pursuant to the Examiner's request during the Interview.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held in *Dayco Products, Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.*, 329 F.3d 1358, 66 U.S.P.Q.2d 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2003), that an "adverse decision" by another examiner may meet the materiality

standard under the amended Rule 56, and thus, Applicants should disclose prior rejections of "substantially similar claim[s]" to the Office. See *also* M.P.E.P.

§ 2001.06(b). Accordingly, although Applicants are not representing that the Office Actions in the co-pending applications are material to the present application and are not admitting that any of the other claims are substantially similar, out of an abundance of caution, Applicants have listed the substantive Office Actions in co-pending applications on the attached form.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the listed documents and indicate that they were considered by making appropriate notations on the attached form.

This submission does not represent that a search has been made or that no better art exists and does not constitute an admission that each or all of the listed documents are material or constitute "prior art." If the Examiner applies any of the documents as prior art against any claims in the application and Applicants determine that the cited documents do not constitute "prior art" under United States law, Applicants reserve the right to present to the office the relevant facts and law regarding the appropriate status of such documents.

Applicants further reserve the right to take appropriate action to establish the patentability of the disclosed invention over the listed documents, should one or more of the documents be applied against the claims of the present application.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Statement, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 29, 2010

By: Wen Li  
Wen Li, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 62,185

Tel: (650) 849-6649